

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Page 2 of the office action notes that Applicant's submission of 3/13/2008 has been entered and separately notes that the amendments filed on 7/23/2007 have been entered and made of record. Applicant wishes to confirm that the amendments of 3/13/2008 have been entered and considered. The Listing of Claims set forth above reflects entry of the 3/13/2008 amendments.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 30, 33, 35-40, 42-45 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by a proposed combination of Utsumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,667) with Ishida (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0133387) and Tanigawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,681). Claims 21, 23, 25-28, 46 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed Utsumi et al.-Ishida-Tanigawa combination, further in view of Official Notice.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Utsumi et al. and Ishida are deficient with respect to the claims for the reasons set forth in the Amendment of March 13, 2008, which reasons are incorporated herein in their entirety.

The office action notes that the claims differ from Utsumi and Ishida by reciting the outputting of the same main information by repeatedly returning to the beginning of the main information when the end thereof is reached. Tanigawa is alleged to remedy this deficiency.

Tanigawa discloses that a predetermined number of frames of image data are repeatedly transmitted together with corresponding control information in order to achieve a simulated interactive environment. See, e.g., Tanigawa, col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 55. As noted in Tanigawa, "what appears to the user as interactive display using bidirectional communication can be achieved using a TV broadcast wave which allows communication in one direction." Tanigawa, col. 4, lines 37-40. In contrast, the claimed main information is to be recorded in an optical recording medium (see, e.g., claim 1, line 3). Indeed, if the predetermined number of frames of image data in Tanigawa were to be recorded in an optical recording medium, it would be impossible to reproduce complete image data in one page. This is because a cursor design is stored in the control unit 155 in the data receiving apparatus 150 in advance, but not transmitted

from the data transmitting apparatus 110. See Tanigawa, col. 25, lines 19-33. Consequently, if only transmitted data is recorded in an optical recording medium, it would impossible to display a full image in one page in Tanigawa. There is simply no motivation to replace the received data holding unit 152 of Tanigawa with an optical recording medium.

Moreover, in Tanigawa, the position information is not information showing a recording position of the predetermined number of frames of image data. The position information shows a position of a cursor design (see col. 28, lines 16-23, X-Y coordinates) or a position of a supplementary design (see col. 33, line 52 to col. 34, line 34 and Figure 29C including X-Y coordinates). In contrast, the claimed recording position information is information showing a recording position of the partial information on the optical recording medium on which the partial information is to be recorded. See, e.g., claim 1, lines 6-7.

In short, Applicant respectfully submits that Tanigawa does not disclose, teach or suggest any feature of the pending claims. Tanigawa merely discloses a transmitting apparatus for an interactive communication system using a broadcast wave, which is not relevant to the claimed subject matter.

In addition, Applicant submits that there would have been no motivation to combine Tanigawa with Utsumi et al. and Ishida. Tanigawa related to a technical field of displaying HTML documents on web site, which is irrelevant to Utsumi et al. and Ishida. The claimed feature of recording information on an optical recording medium as claimed cannot be fairly derived from Tanigawa which relates to displaying an image in an arbitrary position on a display.

Independent claims 9, 12, 18, 30, 33 and 36 include features similar to claim 1. Consequently, these claims and the claims that depend therefrom likewise patentably distinguish from the proposed Utsumi et al.-Ishida-Tanigawa combination.

With respect to claims 21, 23, 25-28, 46 and 47, even assuming (without agreeing) that the taking of Official Notice were proper, the proposed combination of Utsumi et al., Ishida and Tanigawa would still be deficient with respect to the claimed cyclical outputting recited in claims 21 and 27. Consequently, these claims and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over the art applied in the office action.

KURODA et al.

Serial No. 09/885,005

Response to Office Action dated April 7, 2008

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea

Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100